



Claims 14, 19, 29, and 37 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 2, as amended.

Claim 4 has been amended to recite an objective having a system that is free of central obscuration of the aperture. As previously mentioned, the '627 patent includes a diaphragm 22 that is located between the mirrors 21, 23. These mirrors 21, 23 have central bores that define central obscurations which are the angular distribution from the object which cannot reach the image via the mirrors. In contrast, the system of the present invention is free of such central obscuration of the aperture. Since at least this feature is lacking in the disclosed reference, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claim.

Claims 15, 16, 27, 30, and 39 should be allowed as depending from what should now be an allowed independent claim 4.

Claim 6 (as well as claims 9, 29 and 31) stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. Claim 6 has been amended by incorporating the subject matter of claim 1 therein. It appears that this rejection is based on the Examiner's interpretation that a planar mirror (M1, M2) makes an optical group be either catoptric or catadioptric. However, the present amendment renders this interpretation moot since claim 6 now states that the system is devoid of planar folding mirrors. On this basis, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 20, 21, 26, 28, 31 and 40 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 6.

Claims 7 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 10, 12, 36, 43 and 45 stand allowed.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite a projection that includes a number of lens groups and a plurality of arranged curved mirrors, wherein at least two curved mirrors face one another and are free from any lenses being physically therebetween. In the cited reference, there are only two

curved mirrors; however, while the beam path contacts the two mirrors successively along the light path, there are a number of lens elements that are physically between the two mirrors. More specifically, at least lens elements 17/18 and 19/20 are physically between the two mirrors. In direct contrast, the present invention has two curved mirrors that face one another, with the added feature that there are no lens elements physically between these two mirrors as clearly shown in the Figure of the present application. Since this feature is completely lacking in the cited reference, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) cannot be maintained and on this basis, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 33 and 42 should be allowed as depending from what should be an allowed independent claim 8, as amended.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection claim 13 as being anticipated by Williamson. Claim 13 has been amended to recite an objective including more than 2 curved mirrors wherein a most imageward mirror is convex. In Williamson, the most imageward mirror is mirror M6' which is in the form of a concave mirror. Thus, Williamson fails to disclose at least one feature set forth in the claim. On this basis, reconsideration and allowance of claim 13 are respectfully requested.

Claim 17 has been rewritten into independent form by including the subject matter of claim 1 and since the Examiner has only objected to claim 17, this claim should now be allowed in its rewritten form. This is not a narrowing amendment since claim 17 originally depended from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 17 are in order.

Claim 34 should be allowed as depending from what should now be an allowed independent claim 17.

Claim 35 has only been objected to as missing an omitted word and has not been rejected on prior art grounds. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that in its amended form, claim 35 should be allowed.



